UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/597,915	08/28/2006	Kari Raisanen	METSO-64	7851
36528 STIENNON &	7590 02/04/201 STIENNON	1		IINER
	ST., SUITE 201		FORTUNA, JOSE A	
MADISON, W			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
,		1741		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			02/04/2011	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/597,915	RAISANEN ET AL.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	José A. Fortuna	1741	
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap Period for Reply	ppears on the cover sheet wit	h the correspondence address -	-
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING ID. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period. Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statut Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNIC .136(a). In no event, however, may a replay will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONT te, cause the application to become ABA	ATION. Jly be timely filed HS from the mailing date of this communica NDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>04 /</u> 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) ☐ Thi 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowed closed in accordance with the practice under	is action is non-final. ance except for formal matte	rs, prosecution as to the merits	3 is
Disposition of Claims			
4) ☑ Claim(s) 33-65 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrage 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☑ Claim(s) 33-65 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/	awn from consideration.		
Application Papers			
9) The specification is objected to by the Examin 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ac Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the E	cepted or b) objected to be drawing(s) be held in abeyand ction is required if the drawing(s	e. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.12	, ,
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreig a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority document application from the International Bureat * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	nts have been received. Its have been received in Appority documents have been rau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	plication No eceived in this National Stage	
Attachment(s) 1) Motice of References Cited (PTO-892)		mmary (PTO-413)	
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	Paper No(s)	/Mail Date ormal Patent Application	

Application/Control Number: 10/597,915 Page 2

Art Unit: 1741

DETAILED ACTION

Double Patenting

1. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., In re Berg, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); In re Goodman, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); In re Longi, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); In re Van Ornum, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); In re Vogel, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and In re Thorington, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

2. Claims 33-65 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 31-62 of copending Application No. 10/597,940 in view of US Patent No. 6,342,125. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the only difference in the claims is the manner in which the different layers or plies are joined, i.e., the second layer is formed on top of the first layer in the current application, while in the co-pending application the second layer is formed and joined to the first layer while is still wet. However, the different ways in which the webs are joined are very well known in the art and within the pervious of one of ordinary skill in the art, see for example column 1, lines 34-44 of US Patent No. 6,342,125.

This is a <u>provisional</u> obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

A Terminal Disclaimer was received on June 28, 2010, but it was disapproved for the following reasons:

37 CFR 1.321 (c)(3) requires that a TD "Include a provision that any patent granted on that application or any patent subject to the reexamination proceeding shall be enforceable only for and during such period that said patent is commonly owned with the application or patent which formed the basis for the judicially created double patenting." [Emphasis added]

The words "legal title" do not include common ownership as to equitable title.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments, see amendment and request for 4 consideration, filed August 4, 2009, with respect to the prior art rejection have been fully considered and are persuasive. The rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) of claims 33-65 has been withdrawn.

Allowable Subject Matter

- 4. Claims 33-65 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejection(s)

 Double Patenting rejection, set forth in previous office action and repeated in this Office action.
- 5. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: applicants arguments filed on August 04, 2009 are convincing. The combination of prior art does not teach nor fairly suggest the pulsating and non-pulsating dewatering mechanisms in a multi-layer/multi-ply web/system

Application/Control Number: 10/597,915 Page 4

Art Unit: 1741

Conclusion

6. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to José A. Fortuna whose telephone number is 571-272-1188. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:30-6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Matthew J. Daniels can be reached on 571-272-2450. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/597,915 Page 5

Art Unit: 1741

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/José A Fortuna/ Primary Examiner Art Unit 1741

JAF